THE BANGALORE CITY CIVIL COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1980

Motion to Consider

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA (Minister for Law, Parliamentary Affairs and Animal Husbandry).—Sir, I beg to move,

"That the Bangalore City Civil Court (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be taken into consideration".

The question was proposed

† ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ (ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್) ಬಿಲ್ ೧೯೮೦ ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಪತಿಯವರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅದು ಕಾನೂನು ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಆನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವಾರು ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವಾರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಅವಶ್ಯ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಾಗ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಕೆಲವಾರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾಗಿ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು ಎಂದರೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ (ಜ್ಯೂರಿಡಿಕ್ಷನ್), ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ನಾವು ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ೧೦೩ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಅದು ೬-೩-೧೯೭೯ರವರೆಗೂ ಇತ್ತು, ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಮಿತಿ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಯಿತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಕೋಡ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನು ಸರಹದ್ದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೂ ಸರಹದ್ದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟೇನು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮಹತ್ವದಲ್ಲ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಪೆಕ್ಯೂನರಿ ಜ್ಯೂರಿಡಿಕ್ಷನ್‌ನ್ನು ೩ ಸಾವಿರದಿಂದ ೧೦ ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಮುನ್ಸಿಫ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೇಸುಗಳ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾರಣ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಡಿಲೇ ಆಗುತ್ತಿವೆ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ವಿಲೇವಾರಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಯಾವ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ನೋಟೀಸ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವೈಡ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕೇಸಂಗಳು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಲಾಯರ್ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭರವಸೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—೧೦೦ಕ್ಕೆ ೯೦ ಜನರು ಲಾಯರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಾದ ವಿವಾದಗಳು ನಡೆಸುವುದೇ ಲಾಯರ್‌ಗಳು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮತಿಗಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ನಂತರ ೯ (೨) ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಡೌಟ್ ಬಂದಂತಹ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಎಂಬುತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಡೌಟ್‌ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಂತಹ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು, ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಮಹತ್

ವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನಾತ್ಮಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ತ್ರೀ ಟೈರ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಉನ್ನತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆವು. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆಯಂತೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ ಂತಹ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI A. LAKSHMISAGAR.—Sir, when the original bill was before the House for consideration and when Sri, Havanur was piloting this Bill I have had an occasion to point out the haste with which the Civil Courts Bill was placed before the House. Then, an ordinance had been promulgated for the purpose of bringing the City Civil Court Act into force before the Bill actually came up for consideration. There was no urgency to bring this law into force without making adequate administrative preparations. Even to-day you are not in a position to start the courts in accordanee with the provisions of this Act. You do not have administrative capacity to rectify the defects. There is utter confusion created in Bangalore City. So many provisions which the Hon'ble Minister has just now stated, have been noticed subsequent to the passing of the Civil Court Act. Therefore, some amendments were brought in. This is not the end of it. Tomorrow you will come up with other amendments. You are solely responsible for it. The result of continuous amendments to the original Act is that the law Courts in Bangalore City are not in a position to dispose of the matters speedily thereby causing lot of inconvenience to the litigants. There are cases pending in Civil Courts for years together. You are not able to find any remedy for it. You have got to shoulder the responsibility rather than blaming the previous Governments. Government is a continous body. So, it is for the people who run the Government to-day to take steps for speedy disposal a cases pending before the Courts for years together.

Then, I am coming to the provisions of this Bill. After the City Civil Court Bill was passed by this House and the other House it became an Act. The High Court felt that they have been experiencing certain difficulties in view of some of the provisions contained in the original Act. Under the original Act all the matters that are pending before the Civil Judges and the District Judge will go before the High Court for now disposal Therefore, the High Court in its wisdom felt that thousands of appeals will have to be registered before it and hence the High Court recommended that all proceedings pending in the District Court, Court of the Civil Judge and Munsiff's Court be transferred to the City Civil Court instead of to the High Court as at present. All these things created confusion

in the minds of litigant public. As it is, the litigants are put to lot of inconvenience and harassment in view of delay in disposing of the matters pending before various Courts, That being so, why do you come up with infructuous pieces of legislation and pass it in haste causing lot of inconvenience and harassment to the litigants.

Secondly, under this Bill all cases arising out of Rent Control Act will go before the Small Causes Courts. So, the jurisdiction has been changed Do you know that for the last 10 years the house rent control cases have not been disposed of. Either the tenant or the land lord has not been able to get the order expeditiously. Now, according to the amendment fresh notices have to be issued to the parties and you will have to list the files and get them transferred to Court of Small Causes. So, it may take one year or more and by the time notices go to the parties, there will be another amendment. In this process the parties have to suffer a lot and will have to wait for years together to get the orders from the Court.

1-00 P.M.

One may not be able to get vacant possession of his house during his life time. He may get it after his death. That is the situation. They have not been able to create sufficient number of Small Cause Courts for the disposal of Rent Control cases. This is an administrative matter. I have no grouse about it. The result is that the things will continue to remain where they have been even after some years. Therefore, you do not seem to have given thought to the litigant public. You blame lawyers often times. They are not asking any concession from any Government. The Government has been implementing five year plans for the last 30 years and yet no benefit has gone to lawyers, nor they have asked for it. But unfortunately lawyers come in handy for the butt end of the attack. This is the position.

As regards notice, it is the most pernicious aspect of the Bill. If you put up all transferred cases on the notice board, is it notice to the lawyer or the litigant public? Notice must go to the parties. You cannot expect lawyers to inform his client. You cannot expect litigant public to know when you are going to take up his case and you cannot expect him to make a pilgrimage to the Court every now and then. You want to pass on the buck to somebody else. There is difficulty in sending notices to parties for which you are responsible. You want to pass on the blame litigants and you want him to know the dates of transfer of cases by merely putting on the notice board. This is the pernicious aspect of the Bill. I strongly oppose it.

Lastly, I appeal to my learned friend Sri Y. Ramakrishna, who is incharge of Law and Parliamentary Affai to at least awake up now. Let him not come before the House with an infructuous and ill-thought out piece of legislation.

† SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—About dispensing with notices, I will be failing in my duty if I do not support the views of my learned friend Sri A. Lakshmisagar on these points. It will create not only great hardship, but it is also prone to mischief and misuse. If notice is not served after transfer from one Court to another Court, there is every possibility of the land-lord or the tenant getting exparte orders or decrees. Ultimately when it comes to the notice of the aggrieved parties, the matter will have to be taken to High Court by way of a Writ. Particularly in Rent Control cases, in Bangalore City, we know how strongly they are fought, because they are available rights both for the land-lord and the tenant. So far as tenancy right is concerned, it is a valuble right. Therefore, dispensing with notices is against the rule of natural justice. You cannot take it away. If this is challenged in the High Court, it is very likely that it may be set aside. Every party is entitled for notice when you change the law and the court. It may be argued that it is a notice to the lawyer. But the lawyer will have to write to his clients again. Thus again the matter will be protracted. On the other points, I agree with my learned friend Sri A. Lakshmisagar.

SRI. H GANGADHARAN —Regarding the amendment to Section 17 (2) (a) in the statement, for Rs. 3,000, Rs. 10,000 shall be substituted. In several sections you have said that rent control cases must go to the Small Cause Courts, where as Small Cause Courts are governed under the old enactment. Now you are trying to amend the provisions of Small Cause Courts Act through this Bill. You will have to bring an amendment to the old act also. In respect of Bangalore City, this provision cannot be given effect to, because there is an earlier enactment. How can you overcome this difficulty? You have to bring an amendment so far as these two clauses are concerned regarding enhancement of jurisdiction and entrusting to the Small Cause Courts. That is the legal difficulty you will have to face. The second point is, as pointed out by my learned friend, the Rent Control cases have not been disposed of. Instead of entrusting these cases to Small Cause Courts, you could have made a provision for appointment of separate Rent Control Courts. A number of Courts have been introduced and you could have made a provision for easy and quick disposal of rent control cases. You have not done that. You are clubbing all. But the difficulty in disposing of these rent control cases is that, as it is, so many cases including money lending

cases are being dealt by the Small Cause Courts. Now you are also introducing theserent control cases to the Small Cause Courts and these courts willhave to reserve one day for disposal of rent control cases. That is why even after a number ofyears these cases will not be disposed of. Instead of doing that you could have called some Courts as Rent Control Courts wherein these cases could have been disposed of quickly. Such provision could have been made here. I do not know why this discrimination has been done between the Bangalore City and the other cities. We welcome the intention of the Government in reducing the 3 tier system to 2 tier system. This could have been extended to all cosmopolitan cities and corporation areas. By introducing this Bill you want to enrich the advocates of Bangalore only and deprive advocates of other cities of this benefit, because more cases will go to High Court and those who are practicing in High Court will have a bumper crop. Therefore, this Bill could have been extended to other cities also. With these words, I request the Hon'ble Minister to make necessary amendments.

SRI A. LAKSHMI SAGAR.—It will enrich lawyers in Bangalore City because the matters that have come up for disposal before courts in Bangalore City and appeal arising there from will go to High Court.

SRI H. GANGADHARAN.—Those who are practicing in the High Court will be benefited.

SRI M. C. NANAIAH —Sir, the pendency of cases in all the courts have mounted up and giving of notices in respect of another 15 to 20 thousand cases, probably will take more than 2 years. The High Court has also recommended and it is not as if the Government has recommended for dispensing with the notices.

In the statement of objects and reasons, it is being stated thus ; "The High Court also recommended that—

> (iii) provision be made to dispense with the giving of notices to parties after the appeals applications, suits etc., are transferred to the City Civil Court or the Small Causes Court"

In many cases where the jurisdiction is enhanced and the cases are transferred from one court to another, the court feels the difficulty of the transfer. So, I do not think giving of notices to parties is necessary. I think this Bill has been brought on an experimental basis. If the experiment succeeds, will the Government think of extending the scope of this Bill to other Cities also? I welcome this Bill with a view to see that the pending litigations are disposed of at an early date.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್‌ರವರು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನೋಟೀಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೇಸ್ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಾದಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ರಾಜಿ ಆದಾಗ ಕೇಸ್ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳು ಡೇಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ತಪ್ಪು. Why notice should be served on that. ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ 10–15 thousand ಕೇಸ್‌ಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕೇಸ್‌ಗೂ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಎಚ್ ಆರ್.ಸಿ. ಕೇಸಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾದರೆ ಪುನಃ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್‌ರವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಕಾರಣರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಬಿಲ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ದೆಹಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಆದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಜಾರಿಗೆತಂದು ಅದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ತಂದೆವು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಸ್ಮಾಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕೇಸಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಮಹತ್ತರವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಏನು ಇಲ್ಲ, ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಸಭೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI K. H. SRINIVAS.—Does it necessitate consequential change in the Rent Control Act ? This may be clarified.

ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಸಾಗರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಹಳಬೇಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇ ಮೂಲಕ ತಂದಂಥ ಕಾನೂನು ಈವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೆ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟೀವ್ ಮೆಷಿನರಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಅಲ್ಲ ಆರು ವರ್ಷವಾದರೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಆದರೆ ಯಾವಕಾಲಕ್ಕೂ ಏನು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಇದು ಶತಮಾನಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಪರವಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ತಂದಾಗ ಎಡರುತೊಡರುಗಳು ಬಂದೇ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಎಡರುತೊಡರುಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ತರದೆ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will now put the consideration motion to vote. The question is :

"That the Bangalore City Civil Court (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be taken into consideration"

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER. —We shall take up. Clause by Clause consideration of the Bill.

CLAUSES 2 to 10

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is ;

"That Clauses 2 to 10, both inclusive, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 10, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1 *etc.*,

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 1, the Long Title. the Preamble and the Enacting Formula do stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Long Title, the Preamble and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bangalore City Civil Court (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be passed".

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Bangalore City Civil Court (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be passed".

The motion was adopted and the Bill was passed.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now, the House adjourned to meet at 12 Noon on Monday, the 14th July 1980.

The House adjourned at Fifteen Minutes past One of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Monday the 14th July 1980.